

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0125993 to Gutta et al. ("*Gutta*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076 to Logan et al. ("*Logan*").

By this response after final, Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 4, 7, and 9.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an electronic device controlling apparatus comprising, among other things, "detecting means for detecting the personal identification information received from a personal identification information transmitter associated with a person."

Gutta discloses, "detecting [an individual] comprises recognizing the face of the individual or . . . recognizing the speech pattern of the individual". *Gutta*, para. [0017]. *Gutta* further discloses, "[t]he detector preferably includes a camera and/or microphone." *Id.*, para. [0028]. *Gutta* further discloses, "the camera 102a and/or microphone 102b . . . record . . . the individual's facial image or speech pattern." *Id.*, para. [0031].

Therefore, in *Gutta*, one detector is used to detect multiple individuals. *Gutta* fails to disclose that the detector is associated with one specific individual. Accordingly, *Gutta* fails to disclose or suggest "a personal identification information transmitter associated with a person," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Logan fails to cure the deficiencies of *Gutta*, at least because *Logan* fails to disclose or suggest “detecting means for detecting the personal identification information received from a personal identification information transmitter associated with a person,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1. Independent claims 4 and 7, although different in scope from claim 1, are allowable for at least reasons similar to those given for claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable base claims 1, 4, or 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, placing claims 1-9 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 4, 7, and 9 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants further submit that the entry of the amendments would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 3, 2008

By: 
Peter C. Yi
Reg. No. 61,790
202.408.4485